

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

A					
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/545,034	04/06/2000 _i ;	Eduardo Cue	P2512/560	9025	
21839 7	590 03/11/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P POST OFFICE BOX 1404			ZURITA,	ZURITA, JAMES H	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	•		3625		
			DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		I A I'			
	Application				
Advisory Action	09/545,034	CUE ET AL.			
	Examiner	Art Unit	4.17.7		
	James H Zurita	3625	MU		
The MAILING DATE f this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addi	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 23 February 2004 FAILS TO PLAGE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applic (1) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply th places the applica	y to a Ition in		
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing of					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of th no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expi ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). T fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the periof fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the C timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3	re later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing VAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF To the date on which the petition under 37 Cf and of extension and the corresponding arm of the shortened statutory period for reply Office later than three months after the marks.	ng date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. FR 1.136(a) and the approperation of the fee. The approperation of the final of th	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:				
(a) X they raise new issues that would require fur	ther consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	•		
(b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or sin	nplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cand	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims	S.		
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.	•				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejo	ection(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	ıld be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request to application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NO	T place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	enewly		
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	· ·	••			
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-71</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) a	oproved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:					
10.L. Guiot.	Weiffrey A. Smith Primary Examiner				

Continuation of 2. NOTE: in proposed amendment, configuration data is solely determined by administrator, expanding scope of claims...

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (a) request for reconsideration is not persuasive, (b) one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually (c) claims recite nonfunctional descriptive material which, when reading claims as a whole, carries little patentable weight and does not distinguish the invention from prior art and which is not functionall involved in the steps recited..